

Docket No. 501.43326X00
Serial No. 10/733,316
Advisory Action dated July 18, 2007

REMARKS

By the present Amendment, claims 1 and 8 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 8-12 remain pending in the application. Claims 1 and 8 are independent.

In the Office Action of July 18, 2007, the specification was objected to because of a typographical error. Claims 1-4 and 8-12 were rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as based on a non-enabling disclosure. Claims 1-4 and 8-12 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The specification was objected to because of a typographical error.

Applicants disagree with this objection. It appears that the Examiner is reviewing the original specification and not the Substitute Specification which does not include a page 24. Further, review of the corresponding paragraph suggests that this error was previously corrected.

Claims 1-4 and 8-12 were rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as based on a non-enabling disclosure. Regarding this rejection, the Office Action states that processing a digital image is essential to practice the invention, yet it is not recited in the claims.

By the present Amendment, Applicants have revised the language of independent claims 1 and 8 in an attempt to better clarify the features recited therein. Specifically, the claims have been amended to specifically recite that the digital image is processed and subjected to processing. Additionally, the processed digital image is transmitted.

Applicants note, however, that it would be readily apparent to anyone skilled in the art that a digital image that is subjected to a falsification prevention treatment

Docket No. 501.43326X00
Serial No. 10/733,316
Advisory Action dated July 18, 2007.

will produce a resulting subsequent digital image. Clearly, if the results of the image falsification prevention treatment is subjected to digital processing, it is a digital image that is in fact being processed. Nonetheless, claims 1 and 8 have been amended to comply with the rejection and explicitly point out this feature.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that, as amended, the presently pending claims satisfy the requirement of 35 USC §112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 8-12 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Regarding this rejection, the Office Action cites various instances of language that was considered indefinite. For example, the Office Action indicates that it is unclear what is intended to be claimed by the phrase "detecting a defect on said object by processing the results."

This is somewhat perplexing. At the outset, Applicants note that the Office Action has quoted less than what is actually recited in the cited portion of the claim. The claim actually recites "detecting a defect on said object by processing the results of said image falsification prevention treatment and extracting a feature of a detected defect." As discussed above, it should be readily apparent that the digital image being processed is that which results from subjecting the acquired digital image to the image falsification prevention treatment.

The amendments made to claim 1 and 8, however, should remedy this issue.

The Office Action also cites various instances of language that lacked proper antecedent basis. Applicants have therefore made appropriate amendments to address all instances of indefiniteness raised in the Office Action.

Docket No. 501.43326X00
Serial No. 10/733,316
Advisory Action dated July 18, 2007

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 1-4 and 8-12 now satisfy the requirement of 35 USC §112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

For the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is believed in order, and courteously solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are any matters which can be resolved by way of either a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

010/010


OCT 18 2007

Docket No. 501.43326X00
Serial No. 10/733,316
Advisory Action dated July 18, 2007

AUTHORIZATION

Applicants request any shortage or excess in fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, and for which no other form of payment is offered, be charged or credited to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case: 501.43326X00).

Respectfully submitted,
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP.


Leonid D. Thenor
Registration No. 39,397

LDT/vvr
1300 N. Seventeenth Street
Suite 1800
Arlington, Virginia 22209
Tel: 703-312-6600
Fax: 703-312-6666

Dated: October 18, 2007